

A *Buckley 151*
LETTER

TO

Dr. MEAD,

CONCERNING

A NEW EDITION.

OF

Thuanus's *History*.

THE SECOND EDITION.



LONDON:

Printed by Sam. Buckley in Amen-Corner,
1728.

THE
THURSDAY
MAGAZINE
OF
THE
LITERARY
CIRCULAR
AND
SOCIAL
WORLD
FOR
MEN
AND
WOMEN
BY
J. B. BAYLEY
AND
OTHER
CONTRIBUTORS
IN
TWO
MONTHLY
EDITIONS
Price
1/-



A faint, circular watermark or seal impression is visible in the background of the page. The seal is circular with a decorative border. The top half of the border contains the text 'THE BRITISH LIBRARY' in a stylized, serif font. The bottom half of the border contains the year '1994'. In the center of the seal is a heraldic emblem featuring a lion and a unicorn flanking a shield, with a cross above them.

27th January in 1868
1868

To Dr. Mead.

SIR,

IT is now above Three Years since a Gentleman, who has been some Time in *France*, communicated to his Friends here a Design he had formed of translating into *English* from the *Latin*, THUANUS's *HISTORY*; and that his great Motive to it was, the finding certain Manuscripts in several Libraries at *Paris* and elsewhere, that he had been permitted to transcribe, and his Hopes to meet with more upon a further Search, which would furnish such Supplements, Additions, Illustrations, and Corrections, as might serve to make that History more compleat and useful than any Edition of it yet extant.

I was favoured by you with the Perusal of a Letter, in which that Gentleman had written pretty largely on this Subject; and, in Discourse about it, you took Occasion to declare your Opinion, That the best Use to which he could put the Transcripts he had already made and those he might yet make, would be, first and preferably to all other Views, to employ them towards a perfect Edition of that History in the Original. Whereupon I proposed to give him a handsome Gratuity for the Collections he had made and should make, and by the Help of them to undertake the forming and printing of such an Edition. You was pleased to acquaint him with my Proposal, and he having accepted the Terms, has from that time been procuring and transmitting to me whatever Materials he could find any way serviceable to the Design: And he intends, in a Letter addressed to you to give an ample and particular Account, of his Applications to several

very eminent Men in France, who are possessed of Libraries that he judged might afford such Materials ; and of the Result of his diligent and laborious Searches : Which Account will be proper to be printed with the Work, for the due Information and Satisfaction of the Publick.

I N the mean while, Sir, I beg Leave to acquaint you, with the Preparations I have been making, and with the Plan and Method in which I propose to get this Undertaking executed.

I N the first Place, I laid out for all the printed Editions of *Thuanus* ; most of which are so scarce, that it required a good deal of Time as well as Money to procure them, Part here, others from abroad ; and, from the Collection I have made, I find it not only proper, but even necessary, to state to you the following Account of them ; because an imperfect confused and erroneous one has been published by *Job. Petr. Titius* in his *Recensio Voluminum Historicorum Thuanii*, printed at Dant-zick in Quarto 1685, which, tho' scarce, is in the Hands of the Curious ; and if some Passages that seem the most material in it were not set right, might perplex and mislead his Readers, and dispose them to form a wrong Judgment of the Edition now in Hand.

T H E first Edition of any Part of *Thuanus*'s History, was at Paris, in Folio, printed by the Widow of *Mamert Patisson* in 1604. It is intitled, *Historiarum sui Temporis Pars Prima* ; is divided into Eighteen Books ; and beginning from the Year 1546, reaches to 1560.

TITIUS had not seen this Volume printed by *Patisson* : Which is pretty strange ; the Book itself being none of the scarcest, always esteemed by Collectors of Libraries, and having been particularly recommended by *M. Colomies* in his *Bibliotheque choisie*, (which was first published in 1682, three Years before *Titius*'s *Recensio* came out) who says of it, *Quelque Edition que l'on ait de l' Histoire de M. de Thou, il faut y joindre les dix-huit premiers Livres imprimez chez Patisson, à cause de certains endroits qui ne se rencontrent point dans les autres Editions.* *Titius*, having never seen this Volume, says, *Historie Thuanæ primum Parisiis prodierat (1.) in Octava ut Officina vocant : Pars prima, ejusque Tomus alter, A. 1604. Tomi Secundi Pars I. & II. A. 1606, Pars III. 1608. Editio alia (2.) item Parisiis evulgata, sed in Folio, & tomis tribus ; quorum primus & secundus A. 1606. ac partim A. 1607. Tertius A. 1609. exiit.*

I HAVE

I HAVE said the first Part was printed by *Patisson* in Folio 1604. I go on to relate, that the very same Year, 1604, this first Part was printed in Two Volumes in Octavo at *Paris*, by the Brothers *Ambrose* and *Jerom Drouart*: Containing the same Number of Books, Eighteen, and extending to the same Year 1560. To both these Editions the same Privilege to *Thuanus* for printing his History is prefixed, dated *Pridie Eid. VII libris A. S. 1603.*

BUT tho' both these Editions do bear the same Date, as well in the Title, as in the Privilege: Yet what demonstrates *Patisson's* Folio to have been the first printed, is, 1. The *Errata* in that Folio, some of which are whole Sentences altered, and all of them specified by the Author at the end of his Dedication, and promised to be amended in the next Edition, are accordingly corrected, each in its proper Place, in the *Drouarts* Octavo. 2. At the end of the *Drouarts* first Volume in Octavo, is an Addition of this following Passage, which is not in *Patisson's* Folio.

Pag. 453. l. 3. post exsoluit, add.

DUM Rex Bononiæ esset, allatus est ad eum ex India orientali ab homine incognito, sed ut apparebat, moribus barbaro, lapis stupenda specie & natura, videlicet lumine & fulgore mirabiliter cornucanibus, quique totas volutæ ardens incredibili splendore micabat, & jactis quoquo versus radiis ambientem aerem nullis fere oculis tolerabilis latissime complebat; erat et in eo mirabile, quod terra impatentissimus, si cooperiretur, sua sponte et vi facto impetu conseruit evolabat in sublimè; contineri vero includivit ullo loco angusto nulla hominum arte poterat, sed ampla liberaq; loca duntaxat amare videbatur: Summa in eo puritas, eximius nitor, nulla sorde aut labe coquinatus. Figura species nulla ei certa, sed inconstans et momento commutabilis; cumq; esset aspectu longe pulcerrimus, contractari tamen sese impune non patiebatur, et diutius contra aduentibus aut obstinatis cum eo agentibus incommodum afferebat; quod multi multis spectantibus sunt experti: Si quid fortassis ex eo enixius conando detrahebatur, nam durus admodum non erat, nihil minor fibat. Hujus virtutem ac vim esse ad quamplura cum utilem, tum precipue regibus necessarium aiebat hospes, qui miraculum ostentabat, sed quam revelaturus non esset, nisi ingensi pretio prius accepto. Hec ut in Literis Jo. Pipini oculati rei testis,

qui

qui in familia A. Momorantii M. E. medicinam faciebat, ad Ant. Mizaldum et ipsum insignem medicum, pridie Ascensionis Bononia datis, prescripta sunt, ita trado, et amplius discutienda physiologis relinquo. nam veteribus qui de rebus hujusmodi scripserunt, similis lapis necne cognitus fuerit, nec Pipinus iis literis se scire dicit, nec ipse affirmaverim.

IN 1606, the *Drouarts* printed, in Folio, the same first Part of *Thuanus*, reaching (as is before said) to the Year 1560. But whereas this first Part was in the two Editions above mentioned (viz. that in Folio by *Patison*, and that in Octavo by the *Drouarts*) divided into 18 Books; it is in this divided into 26 Books.

To this first Part and Volume in Folio, was added a second Volume in Folio, printed the same Year, 1606, by the *Drouarts*. Which second Volume begins, as it should, with the 27th Book, and carries on the Work to 49 Books inclusive, and to the Year 1572.

IN the same Year, 1606, the *Drouarts* did also print in two Volumes in Octavo, the said second Volume just mentioned to have been printed by them in Folio. And this they did to continue the Set in Octavo published by them in two Volumes 1604. But, in Conformity to their Folio Edition, they begin these 3d and 4th Volumes with Book the 27th, (having no Regard to the Division of Books, which was into 18, in their said two first Volumes in Octavo;) and by a new Division, the Number of Books (which in the last mentioned Folio Volume was carried to 49) is in the two Volumes in Octavo I am now speaking of made 51.

IN 1607, the *Drouarts* printed, in Folio, a further Continuation of the History, extending it from 1572 to 1574. And here again, having no Regard to their forementioned second Volume or Part in Folio which ended with the 49th Book, they conform to the new Division of Books made in their 3d and 4th Volumes in Octavo, and so begin this in Folio with the 52d Book, and end it with the 57th.

IN 1608, the *Drouarts* printed this Continuation in Octavo, to carry on their Set of Octavos; and, rightly, made this fifth Octavo Volume begin with the 52d Book, and end with the 57th.

I HAVE been thus particular in marking the Dates of the several Volumes printed in Octavo and Folio

Folio hitherto by the *Drouarts*, and in noting the Variations in the Number of Books in them ; because the stating clearly, yet succinctly, those Variations, (which give *Titius* very great Inquietude, and make no small Part of his Book) shews, that they are really of little Importance ; the different Divisions of the Books making no Gap in the Series of the History, or leaving any Chasm of Time.

IN 1609, *Jerom Drouart*, his Brother *Ambrose* dying the preceeding Year, printed another Volume in Folio, which beginning with the 58th Book, carries forward the History to the 80th inclusive, and ends with the Year 1584.

DROUART did not go on, to keep up the Set of Octavos with the new Continuation last mentioned. But finding (very probably) unequal Numbers left in Stock of the several former five Volumes in Octavo, (as all Booksellers know is constantly the Case, when the Parts of any Work are printed at several Intervals of Years;) I say this being very probably the Case, or for what other Reason is not material, he resolved to drop the Octavos, and to print a new Set of the whole History (as far as the Author had given it then, *viz.* 80 Books) in Eleven Volumes in *Duodecimo*.

TITIUS had not seen this Edition in *Duodecimo*, when he wrote his *Recensio* ; but in his *Re-tensionis Lustratio*, he gives the following Account of it.

EDITIO hex in *Forma Duodecima*, est *Parisiensis* *tertia ac minima* ; cum *Prima* in *Ottava* [I have already shewn this to be a Mistake, but (leaving *Patison*'s Volume out of the Question at present) the Judgment he is now going to give of this Edition in *Duodecimo*, deserves Attention.] *De Tertia illud commonendum est*, esse eam omnino duabus illis prioribus longe praeponendam. *Primum enim in hac Libri omnes accuratissime distributi, rectissimeque numerati sunt* [Had he compared this with the other two Editions of the *Drouarts*, he would have observed, that there is in this *Duodecimo* a new Division of several of the first 27 Books :] *quos in illis gravissime aberrasse observarimus*. *Deinde que addi Thuanus, omittive, atque emendari in his 80 Libris sum voluit, in Editione hac Parisiensi tertia probe curata perspicimus* : *Neque id tantum in Tomis duobus ultimis, X. et XI, qui A. 1614, verum etiam in IX prioribus qui A. 1609 excusi. Exemplo id cognosci luculentissimo potest* :

*In parte quarta, seu Tomo tertio operis, Lutetiae, A. 1609
in Folio editi, initio premittuntur addenda et corrigenda
satis multa: Qua sane omnia in Editione, quam hic com-
mandamus, Tertia, summo Studio ac Fide exactissime
suppleta atque emendata inveniuntur.* That is well;
but he should have taken Notice (of what must be
attended to in our new Edition) that every one of the
first Eight Volumes of these Eleven in *Duodecimo*, has at
least a Leaf containing a good Number of *Errata* and
Omissa to be corrected or inserted in those respective
Volumes.

As the Variety of Divisions of the Books of *Thuanus*'s
History above specified, looks a little oddly, I will here
give you some Reasons for it, taken from the Preface
to the Edition in *Duodecimo*. The first of them may be
the Author's, viz. *Nec est quod te conturbet si librorum
aliquot initia secus ac primo fuerant reprias, quidni super
te sua uti quisque statuerit, ita jus sit? quanquam et
hec mutatio ratione consilioque non careat, nimtrum ut
effet opere in magno ubi subsistere sapius et respirare posse.*
The rest seems to come from *Drouart*, who therein re-
flects on the *Frankfort* Printers, for Pyrating (as they
call it) with some little pretended Improvements, the
several Parts of *Thuanus* as they came out at *Paris*, viz.
*Tum ut se se luentius supervacuis officiis abstinerent, qui
jam corporis hujuscemodi compaginem apie decenterque
coherentem capiunt aut summarum commatis five para-
graphis divellere, frustillatimque concorpore medirabantur;
quin et politicas, si placet, ad paginarum marginem notas
parturiebant. Fidem huius tuam, quisquis es Lector, ap-
pello; apage abderitica deliramenta; sit suus operi nitor,
sua historia simplicius; integra tibi quicquid volentis obser-
vandi sentiendi libertas.*

BEING got into this Preface, I must observe, be-
cause others else will observe it, that this Edition in
Duodecimo is therein expressly called *Editio Tertia*; which
some may at first Sight think justifies *Titius* in pronoun-
cing it the Third Edition. But, in short, as *Parisson*'s
Volume does and will subserve (notwithstanding *Titius*
never saw it) so in Fact this in *Duodecimo* is a fourth
Edition, let the Preface call it what it will. The *Drou-
arts* (or the Survivor of them) might call it their Third
Edition, very properly, and indeed (as I hinted
above) they may be suspected of sliding some Passages
into this Preface for their own Interests; for, at the
Beginning

Beginning of the last Volume in Folio printed by *Jeronim Drouart* in 1609, and at the Beginning of the 9th Volume by the same *Drouart* in 12°, there is the following Advertisement, which, tho it refers to this Preface, could not certainly (one would think) be of *Thuanus*'s own drawing up.

QUOD harumce historiarum scriptor in operis limine nuper edici voluit, non placere sibi miseram ardorium, qui in alienis scriptis ingeniosi videri cupiunt, ambitionem, idipsum hec etiam iterandum venit, ob inofficissimam male feriari cujusdam typographi sedulitatem, qui superioribus nundinis editos Francofurti ad Mœnum precedentes libros minime ad postremam Parisiensem editionem, quod saltem debuit, expressos notis conspersit ineptis et frivolis; sane hominem ut ab incepto desisteret, viri probi et graves in Germania passim hortati fuerant, quibus ille, si pudori si otio consuluisse, parere necesse habebat. Sed is fuit vervecei capitis stupor, ut prudentissimis monitis pericaciter obsurdueris. Itaquo, quando facta infœla fieri nequeunt, satis vindicata videbitur injuria, si nugatoris illius marrucinitas quasi Marsyæ cutis ad ludibrium proposita ceteros hujusmodi nebulones absterreat et cispellar. Lutetiae Parisior. prid. Eid. Vtil. 1609.

Of several German Editions that I have by me, only one of them printed at Offenbach, has the *Francfort* Printer's Answer to this Advertisement, which I therefore subjoyn here; as a Curiosity; and at the same Time as serving in some Measure to my present Purpose.

QUOD Auctör hujus operis olim edictum, & nuper iteratum voluit, non probare se nempe meam in recudendis ipsius libris, adjicendisque notis marginalibus, sedulitatem: *Id* in frontispicio hujus Tomi modestiori response, hoc est, Germanica, diluendum fuit. Nam nec ego ulla ambitione ductus *Thuani* historias à typis Parisiensibus transcripti, sed communis utilitatis promovenda studio sumptus illos feci. Nec Note marginales quicquam inferunt, quo vel mens auctoris vim patiatur, vel scriptorius genus deformetur. De quo ad virorum doctorum totius Germaniae judicia confidenter provoco: utpote quibus exemplum Francofurtense magis arridere vel inde constat, quod hoc illo vendibilius et in Officina mea crebrius expeditur. Tantum abest ut viri probi et graves in Germania passim ab incepto me dehortati sint. Quin fortius manifestum ut sit, *Thuanus* viro eximio et præstantissimo unius typographi Parisiensis (quem mea hac editio male habuit)

virulentis suggestionibus obrepsum esse. Eum itaque rogatum velim maximopere, ne dum ipsius Historiam viri docti in Germania (quorum testimonia satis magno numero, nullo etiam dissuadente vel dehortante, penes me sunt) ex officina mea impressoria flagitarunt indesinenter, quorum votis ego tandem respondi, ob id innocentem mihi, et plane nil sequius cogitanti, succenseat. Typographus vero tanta impatienzia instigator, brevibus admonitus sit, ne quod ipse et sua gentis alii innumeri in recudendis nostris libris jure (ut dixerunt) suo dudum factitarunt, id in me tantopere reprehendat: adeoque clarorum virorum indignationem et bilem concitare porro desistat. Alioquin justissima talionis lege, virgulam censoriam acriorem et severiorem a Germanis certo certius experturus. Francofurti ad Moenum, Kal. Martii A. N. C. 1610.

You have seen above, how the Printer of the first *Francfort* Folio was censured for dividing the Books of the History into Sections or Paragraphs, and putting marginal Notes, which are ridiculed as aiming to be political but being frivolous and silly; and how that Printer defended those Notes. The Truth of it is, they were innocent things, being only short Contents of each Paragraph placed in the Margin where the Paragraph begins. Now here let me observe to you, that *Thuanus* himself thought fit, in the Edition of his first Volume by *Rob. Stephens* at *Paris* in 1618, and in the Copy of the whole History which he sent to *Lingelshiem*, (both which will come to be mentioned distinctly in their proper Place,) to put at the Head of each Book an *Epitome* (as he terms it) or Summary of the Contents of it; but still he made no Division of the Books into Paragraphs. Upon this, the *Francfort* Printer of the Edition in Folio in 1625—28, not only puts those Summaries at the Head of every Book; but making every distinct Matter in the Summary his Rule for dividing each Book into Paragraphs, gives in the Margin the Contents of each Paragraph in the very Words of the Summary, that is in the Author's own Words. Thereby avoiding the former Reproach of making frivolous or political marginal Notes; and, in my Opinion, not ill consulting the Ease and Benefit of his Readers.

BUT to proceed. *Thuanus* has expressly declared which Edition of his History he himself held to be the Third. The Account of the *Lapis Indicus*, which you have read above, is not (as I have said) in *Patisson's* Volume,

Volume, 1604. *Thuanus* had unluckily pickt it up, and added it to the first Volume of the Octavo Edition by the *Drouarts*, printed after *Patisson's* Folio in the same Year 1604. Now, in April 1608, answering a Letter of *Camden's* (*vid. Camd. Ep. p. 97.*) he thanks him for animadverting friendly on his Credulity, in taking upon Trust and telling that Story, and says, *That having before Camden wrote to him found out he had been imposed upon, he had caused it to be left out of his History; ut ex editione tertia prima partis ante annum publicata constare poterit, in qua totum hoc omisum est*: The Edition *Thuanus* here (rightly) calls the Third, is that of the *Drouarts* in Folio, the first Volumes of which were printed in 1606 and 1607, where this Story is accordingly omitted. He could not in 1608 use those Words *ante annum publicata*, to denote the Edition in *Duodecimo*; for that was not begun till the Year 1609.

I believe you will think I have proved this Point but too elaborately: Yet it was necessary to fix it, because an Occasion will soon offer itself of mentioning with particular Notice another *Paris* Edition, which in the Preface to it is stiled the *Fourth*.

Be it here observed, that the abovementioned Editions of *Thuanus*, were all that came out at *Paris* in the Life-time of the Author, under his own Inspection, and publickly owned by him.

I must now give an Account of the Editions of those Parts of *Thuanus's* History which came out at *Francfort* within the same Compass of Time; i. e. during the Life of *Thuanus*.

TITIUS says, That the first Edition at *Francfort*, was in Folio in One Volume, and contained the first 57 Books of the History; and that there is no Date to the Title, but he (rightly) conjectures it was in 1608. I have this Edition, and observe upon it, 1. That no Regard is had at all in it to *Patisson's* Volume. 2. That on comparing the *Drouarts* Octavo and their Folio together, it has from both given an orderly and unbroken Division of the Number of Books of the History; as by my foregoing Account of those two Editions you may have seen might easily be done. (That is to say, for the first 26 Books it has observed the Division of Books in the *Drouarts* Folio; from the 26th to the 51st inclusive, it has followed the Division of Books in the *Drouarts* third and fourth Volumes in Octavo; and

from the 51st to the 57th inclusive, it agrees both with the *Drouarts* Folio and Octavo.) 3. That (besides splitting every Book into Paragraphs, and by marginal Notes marking the Contents all along,) it has taken into its proper Place the Story of the *Lapis Indicus*, which I have said above was added at the End of the *Drouarts* first Volume in Octavo, but omitted in their Folio. What it has done as to other Passages wherein those two Editions of the *Drouarts* vary, is not worth the while to examine minutely; This Passage alone (if there were nothing else) gave the *Drouarts* a Handle to animadvert upon the German Printer (as you have read above in their Advertisement affixed to their Continuation printed 1609) that the *Libri precedentes* (i. e. the 57 Books) which he had published *Superioribus nundinis Francofurti ad Moenum*, were *minime ad postremam Parisiensem editionem, quod saltē debuit, expressi*.

TITIUS says, the second Tome of the *Francfort* Edition in Folio, is dated 1617. That is, he had one so dated: But I have one dated 1610, which besides that Date in the Title, has in the next Leaf the Printer's Answer, bearing the same Date, to *Drouart's* Advertisement against him. I have also another dated as *Titius's* in 1617; but by comparing them, I find the latter is of the very same Impression as the former, and has only a new Title put to it, the Printer's said Answer being omitted. This Tome carries on the History from the 58th to the 80th Book inclusive, and ends with the Year 1584. It was proper for me to mark this Difference of Dates of the Title Pages: For as this second Volume was really printed in 1610, as the first was in 1608, they could neither of them be copied from the *Drouart's* Duodecimo, which *Titius* commends so much, and which was not begun till 1609 nor finished till 1614.

He mentions also an Edition in five Volumes in Octavo at *Francfort*, which I have. The Title to the first Volume has, as he says, no Date. The second and third are dated 1614. These first three Volumes (which are all I have Occasion to speak of now) contain the same Number of Books, and the same Division of Books, as do the forementioned *Francfort* Folios, viz. 80. This Edition in Octavo has no Regard to *Patisson's* Volume at all: It has the Story of the *Lapis Indicus*; but it has no marginal Notes, as have the Folios; probably because the Printer being reprimanded on that Score (by the Au-
thor,

thor, at the Instigation of the *Drouarts*, as he supposed) chose to make it resemble more the *Paris Editions*. For the rest, this Octavo Edition (according to *Titius*) agrees intirely with the *Francfort Folio*.

I here dismiss this simple Story of the *Lapis Indicus*, which the *Francfort Printers* were so careful to preserve, and which *Titius* shews no little Concern for, when he says, *Pipinum, Thuano laudatum, si suis ipse oculis videt, ludere voluisse, credibile vix video*; with this Observation, That if *Titius* had seen *Fortunius Licetus*'s Book *de Lapis Bononiensi*, which was published in 1640, and which therefore he might have seen, tho' he could not *Camden's Letters* (where *Thuanus* tells *Camden* how that Fiction was palmed upon him,) which were not published till 1691, i. e. six Years after his *Recensio* came out; he might have read a Letter about it from *Petrus* and *Jacobus Puteanus* dated in 1639, wherein they tell *Licetus* they had sent him the very Letter from *Pipinus* to *Mizaldus* which they had found among their Kinsman *Thuanus*'s Papers; and then they go on to say they wondered *quomodo illustrissimus historiarum scriptor, vir et alias emunctissime naris, sibi tam facile imponi passus sit. Sed agnatum errorem cito emendavit, nam hac mira de lapide illo Bononiæ Regi nostro Henrico II. oblatæ, in omnibus editionibus Lutetiae censis, omissa sunt, praterquam in una sola, eaque valde manca, in cuius salce inter additamenta hec scripta reperiuntur, que postea Typographi Germani in omnes suas editiones, frustra reclamante auctore, transfulerunt.*

PERE le Long mentions an Edition of *Thuanus* in 10 Vol. in *Douze, Francofurti*. But as he errs, in his List of the Editions of *Thuanus*, where he says the *Drouarts* Edition in Octavo is in nine Volumes, when it is but in five, and those five answer all his Description of what he calls nine; so, as he does not mention the *Francfort* Octavo in five Volumes, and describes the ten Volumes in *Douze* in a Manner which perfectly suits that Octavo, I shall doubt he errs likewise in this Particular, and that there is no *Francfort* Edition in *Douze*, till I have a Sight of it, which after long Search here and by Friends abroad, I have not yet been able to procure. *Titius* makes no mention of any such Edition at *Francfort* in *Douze*.

THUS much for the Editions of *Thuanus* any where during his Life, and for the Number and Divisions of Books, and the Time to which those Editions of his History extended.

THE next thing to be observed, is, that *Thuanus* some Years before he died, resolved to deposite, and accordingly did a little before his Death deposite in the Hands of a Friend of his M. *Lingelshiem* at *Heidelberg*, Privy-Counsellor to the Elector *Palatine*, a perfect Copy of his whole History; that he had sometimes Thoughts of delaying the Publication of the latter part of his History, one while that which came after the 51st Book or the Year 1572; and another while that which came after the 80th Book, or the Year 1584; and that he intended to have continued his History to the Year 1610, when *Henry the Fourth* was killed, tho' he carried it on no further than the Year 1607. Which Designs, and the Reasons of them, are clearly enough set forth in the following Passages.

M. *Lingelshiemius*, in a Letter to *Thuanus* dated from *Heidelberg*, in 1606, after having extolled what was then published of his History, (viz. 51 Books) and expressed his Satisfaction that he was going on with it, says, *Catetrum cur reliqua adhuc premenda existimes, rationes tuae mihi plene satisfaciunt: Et sufficit ut saltem Posteritas frui possit thesauro isto. Sed quas grates ibi agam dignas, qui me etiam ante Editionem, participem tanti boni facere polliceris! Profecto mancupio me tuum fecisti, ut nihil tam grave unquam mihi impositurus sis, quod in tuam gratiam non lubentissime sim subiurans.*

THUANUS having in 1607 published 57 Books of his History, says in a Letter to *Camden*, dated *Eid. Apr. 1608*, *Nova Editio nostrarum Historiarum sub prelo est, cui XXIII Libri accident, ut omnino XXX efficiantur: Reliqui XLV qui superant, alia tempora, alios mores postulant.* And,

IN another, dated in *July 1615*, *Thuanus* in Answer to a Letter of *Camden's*, says, *Nos in eodem lubentur ægeo; eadem nos maligna astra aspiciunt; iidem astus; eadem procellæ susque deque in scopulos et brevia impellunt.*

— *Contemptu contumelias illatas ulciscamur, ad posteritatem ultro provocantes, ad quam potius quam ad præsens seculum semper respexerunt, quicunque gnaviter & cum publica utilitate in scribenda Historia laborarunt.*

— *Qua sequuntur ad Elisabethæ obitum, ut reliqua, qua ad me misisti, fac brevi à te habeamus; et si fieri potest, etiam serenissimi et optimi vestri Principis initia usque ad annum hujus seculi X. quo nobis eruptus *Henricus Magnus*; nam ad eum usque annum decrevi, si Deus vitam*

ram et otium dederit, annales nostros, quos intermisram, superfite illo minime ulro porrecturus, continuata narratione persequi, ut cui viro tantum Christianus orbis debuit, eis am mortuo justa persolvantur. Ad qua non parum vestra me juvabunt, quod et cum rebus nostris conjuncta et ad universa Historia ornamentum ea summopere pertineant. Scio te minime ab his cessare, et diligentia tua effici, ne rerum apud vos gestarum memoria intercidat; qua si lucem publicam aspiceret nondum finet is, qui jubere potest, at potes ea cum amicis communicare, ad gloriam ipsius eadem fide universo operi inferenda; quod ut facere velis enixe te rogo.

I proceed now to speak of *Thuanus's* last Will, which is printed in the Geneva Edition of his History 1620. It was made in July 1616. In it he appoints Eight Gentlemen of good Rank to be *Tutores*, *Guardians* or *Trustees* to his Children, to take Care of the Estate and Effects he left them till they should come of Age. A Particular which I need not have mentioned, were it not for explaining a Passage which I shall quote by and by from a Letter of *M. de Peiresc* to *Camden*.

THUANUS having in his Will taken Occasion to speak of *Petrus Puteanus*, whom he therein styles *cognatum suum, et multis nominibus sibi carum*; and also of *Nicolaus Rigaltius*, whom he styles *in Senatu Advocatum, et Regia Biblioteca Curatorem, virum doctissimum ac juxta probum*; mentions his History in the following Words, *Historiarum mearum, quas ad Dei gloriam, et publicam utilitatem, sine odio et gratia, Deum ipsum testor et homines, conscripsi, paratam Editionem, si ante quam ipsa edatur moriar, iisdem committo; praeципioque ut ea in re Sammarthanorum Fratrum, qui me in toto opere multum opera sua et diligentia adjuverunt, consilio utantur. Lubrificationes item omnes alias meas fidei eorundem Puteani et Rigaltii committo.*

THUANUS having taken the Measures above described, viz. the sending a Copy of his History to *Linslethemi*, and leaving to the Care of *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius* what is specified about his History in his Will; Notice must be here taken, that soon after the making of his Will, he employed *Robert Stephens* [the third Robert, of the Family of Stephens, famed for Learning and good Printing] to print a perfect Edition (from the Copy called in his Will the *parata Editio*) of his History: But while it was in the Press the Author died, (in 1617.) The first Volume

Volume (which was all that Rob. Stephens did of the History,) came out in the Year 1618. It is intituled, *Jac. Aug. Thuani Historiarum sui Temporis Libri 80, de 1431 Editio Quarta, auctior et castigatior*; contains 26 Books, divided in the same Manner as those in the Duodecimo Edition of *Drouart*, (except only the 7th Book, which begins in a different Place;) and ends with the Year 1560.

P E R E le Long, in his List of the Editions of *Thuannus*, sets down one as printed at *Paris* in 1619 in ten Vol. in 12°, with this Title, *Thuani Historiarum Libri 80 usque ad annum 1584*. I have caused Enquiry to be made for this Edition, both here and abroad, but have not yet been able to procure it: For which, if such an Edition there be, I have the less Concern, because you see by the Title, that it contains only the very same Number of Books, and extends to the same Time, as do the *Drouarts* Folio and Duodecimo. *Titius* makes no mention of any such Edition at *Paris* in 12° in 1619.

N. B. THERE has been no Edition in France since the Year 1619, of any Part whatsoever of *Thuannus's* History, in the original Latin.

I should now give an Account of *Lingelshiem*'s publishing the Copy intrusted to him: But I must previously observe, that He acknowledging the first Volume printed by *Robert Stephens* to be genuine and authentick, made use of it intire in his Edition of the whole History, which was printed at *Geneva* in 1620. His own Words are these, *Paulo ante quam obiret Auctior, jussu ejus nova Editio Lutetiae per Robertum Stephanum cudi cœperat, que auctoris fato interrupta est, primo tantum volumine confecto, quod in hac editione bona fide representavimus: Neve quid desiderari jure posse, hanc quoque tibi (Lectori) ex eodem volumine prefationem damus, et si totius operis editioni non consentiat. Lingelshiem* only says, that this Preface does not suit the Edition (he was about to give) of the whole Work; but this is a plain Proof, that *Thuannus* with the Copy of his History did not send him any such Preface. Probably *Lingelshiem* thought it was the Author's own, and so let it go as he found it without any further Animadversion. But I cannot help thinking there is more of the Printer than of the Author in this Preface, as I have conjectured there was in others. For, in the first Place, as the Title and Preface of a Book are generally the last Sheets printed, and as this Volume did

did not come out till the Year after the Author died, the Printer had it the more in his Power to make the Preface subservient to his own Interest (which with respect to the *Francfort* Printer was the same as that of *Drouart.*) *Secondly,* This Preface is (as *Titius* rightly observes) mostly copied from that prefixed to *Drouart's* Edition in *Duodecimo*, and so verbally, that where in the former it is said the Author *Tertiam illam concinnavit Editionem, locis aliquot inculcatam asque refectam: quam adeo ceteris posthac uspianam cudentis pro Archetypo esse velit, et vero jubeat, &c.* the very same Words are repeated in this new Preface, only *Quartam* is substituted in the Room of *Tertiam*: And then follows the Substance of the *Invective* against the *Francfort* Printer (already given at large from the *Advertisement* in *Drouart's* last Volume in *Folio* in 1609,) which *Invective* *Tuius* thinks is drawn into this new Preface very improperly, and in Point of Time does not tally or piece well with the Date of this new Preface: Which Date being *Anno 1617*, without specifying any Month, does not of itself distinguish whether it was formed before or after the Author's Death, which was in *May* that Year. Most probably it was afterwards; and being in the main copied crudely from that of *Drouart's* *Duodecimo*, no Wonder *Tertiam Editionem* was of Course changed into *Quartam*; tho' indeed (as I have superabundantly shewn) it was the Fifth. This is all I think necessary to say here of this Preface, or of the true Number of the *Paris* Editions hitherto. I go on now to what is more material.

IN 1620 *Lingelshemius* published his Edition of the whole History. And in the Preface says, *Habes, Lector, Jacobi Augusti Thuani historiarum sui temporis opus perductum usque ad annum 1607, comprehensum Libris 138. Prodierant antea Libri 80, nunc auctiores; promuntur jam 58 qui lucem habentus non viderunt—Summa omnium expectatione sperabamus fore, ut quibus auctor testamento curam editionis operis sui incomparabilis injunxerat, Nicolaus Rigaltius et Petrus Puteanus viri clarissimi desiderio nostro satisfacerent: Sed quod auctor quodammodo præviderat, fore, ut iniquitas temporum impedimento esset, id ipsum in causa esse deprehendi cur illi editionem diutius premant prudentia publico detrimentosa. Ne igitur bono generis humani elaboratum opus diutius lateret, ego cui Thuanus ipse lucubrationum suarum, paulo antequam excederet, descrip-*

tum ex autographo suo Exemplar habere permiserat, hoc amicitiae defuncti et utilitatis publica debere me existimavi, ut dum differunt illi et meliora tempora expectant, claustra effringerem, et luci darem opus. —

M. De Peiresc, in a Letter to Camden dated 14 Oct. 1620, writes thus, *Nous venons d'apprendre qu'on a imprimé en Allemagne toute l'histoire entière de feu Monsieur de Thou, il me tard bien de voir ce que c'est. Cela m'a fait souvenir de la vôtre, et désirer qu'elle puisse sortir de vos mains pour le bien du public. Si celle de Monsieur de Thou, ne se fust trouvée que chez lui, elle courroit Fortune d'estre supprimée ; car ses executeurs testamentaires, tuteurs de ses Enfans, la vouloient faire mettre dans le feu pour des intérêts particuliers : Monsieur Lingelsheim, à qui feu Monsieur de Thou en avoit confié une copie, a tout sauvé. Pour l'honneur de Dieu songez à la vôtre, et si durant votre vie vous faites difficulté de la mettre sous la presse, qu'il y en ayt plus d'une copie, et qu'elles ne soyent pas toutes de dela la mer.* I give this Passage, because having been printed in Dr. Smith's Collection of *Camd. Epist.* it cannot be concealed : But I am inclined to think better of Persons of Eminence whom *Thuanus* chose for Trustees ; and besides, the Care and Custody of the Copy he left of his History, was by his Will committed to other Persons. This is all I shall offer upon this Particular at present.

THE Similitude of the Dispositions of *Thuanus* and *Camden*, and of the Times with respect to the Governments under which they lived, will excuse any adding a few Lines more relating to *Camden* only.

P E T R U S P U T E A N U S, in a Letter by which he answered one from *Camden*, writes thus, X Kal. Dec. 1620. *Cum de Historia tua agis, et de me Depositario cogitas, non male certe cogitas : fidelem enim et vere amicum bac in re experieris ! tantum effice, ut tuto ad me perforatur.*

IT is necessary, for the full Explanation of some Passages of the preceding Quotations, to give this that follows, from the Life of *Camden*, prefixed by Dr. Gibson, now Lord Bishop of London, to his *Britannia*. ‘ The First Part of *Camden's Annals of Queen Elizabeth*, which extended to the Year 1589, met with an agreeable Reception ; which made his Friends impertunate with him to finish what he had begun. — ‘ But the Censure which he met with in the Business of

of Mary Queen of Scots, and the private Resentments of some Persons who thought him too severe in the Character of their Ancestors, made him peremptorily resolve, that the second Part should not see the Light till after his Death. — And lest the common Fate of posthumous Papers should be urged by them, he took Care that a fair Transcript should be deposited in the Hands of his intimate Friend Petrus Puteanus, and kept the Original by him, which is now in the Library of Sir John Cotton. By this means the second Tome did not see the Light, till the Year 1625. [In which Year, on the 27th of March, K. James I. died.] i. e. two Years after the Death of Camden.

THE several Editions of *Thuanus's History* that were printed at *Paris* during the Life of the Author, having been already enumerated and described ; it may be proper here to remind you, that every successive Edition of those Parts of his History which were reprinted at *Paris*, had some Alterations in it from the former.

I will here likewise lay before you the following Particulars. I. In the Title of the first Volume by *Rob. Stephens*, which *Thuanus* put to the Press a little before he died, the Number of Books of the History is said to be 143 ; Whereas *Lingelshiem's* Edition carries in the Title but 138 Books. This Difference only shews, that the Author persisted to the last Year of his Life in the Design of continuing his Work from 1607 to 1610. when K. Henry IV. was assassinated ; and that he proposed to comprehend that 3 Years Continuation in five Books ; but did not live to write them.

II. *Lingelshiem* in the Title to his Edition makes *Thuanus's History* begin *ab Anno 1543*, which is copied in the last *Francfort* and *Geneva* Titles. *Boeclerus* and others, with whom *Titius* joyns, have contended that it begins *Anno 1546*, i. e. with the 2d Book ; arguing rightly, that *Thuanus* calls the first Book the *Prefatio* or *Introduction* to his History, and says expressly at the Entrance into his 2d Book that he there begins his History. Now what happens to determine thoroughly this Matter for them against *Lingelshiem*, is, that in the Collection of original Letters of several Learned Men lately published by *Burmannus*, there is (Vol. I. p. 407.) one to *Lipsius* in 1599 from *Thuanus*, who tells him, *Nos in Historia hujus temporis, quod publicis negotiis suffurari possimus*

possimus, tempus impendimus. — Ab anno hujus Seculi XLVI, hoc est a bello Germanico, initium feci.

You will be pleased to recollect, that the last Edition at *Paris*, in the Author's Life-time, of the first 80 Books of his History, reaching to the Year 1584, was in 1614, (that being the Date of the two last Volumes of *Drouart's Duodecimo* :) That the Author designed a new and perfect Edition of his whole History, which he had extended to the Year 1607; That he deposited one Copy of it in the Hands of *M. Lingelshiem*: That he kept another, intending, had he lived, to publish it at *Paris*; but devolved by his Will, in Case he died before it was finished, the Care of that Edition on *P. Puteanus* and *N. Rigalius*, who were to be assisted by the Brothers *Sammarthani*: That the Author did put the first Volume, containing 26 Books, into the Press, at *Paris*, a little before his Death; which was published by *Rob. Stephens* in 1618: That in 1620 *M. Lingelshiem* reprinted that Volume at *Geneva*, declaring it agreed with that Copy the Author had intrusted with him; at the same time publishing the rest intire from the Author's own Copy; and adding to the History the Author's Life.

HERE then we begin to tread upon firm Ground: And here we must lay the Foundation of our new Edition.

IN the first Place, treating our Historian as if he were an old Clasick, we will give this *Geneva* Edition of 1620 as the Text, and at the Foot of every Page shall stand the different Readings, (exhibiting the Omissions or Insertions of Passages, and the Alterations of Sentences or Expressions, whenever the Sense is thereby altered,) collected from the several *Paris* Editions, viz. *Patison's Folio*; and the *Octavo*, *Folio*, and *Duodecimo*, of *Drouart*; distinguishing each from the other. Thus doing, we shall fairly clear our Hands of all those Editions; the latest of which goes no further, (as has been shewn) than the 80th Book: And shall fully satisfy every Reader's Curiosity: upon whatever Notion, of one or other of those Editions being preferable to the rest, that Curiosity may have been raised.

HAVING told you what Use shall be made of all the *Paris* Editions that were published during the Author's Life-time; I am now to speak of the *Francfort* Editions, printed in the same Compass of Years; and must tell you at once, that they are of no Manner of Use at all.

If it could be said of them severally, that they are Copies of those *Paris* Editions which preceded them in Point of Time respectively, it would be all the Honour that could be done them; for no one, not even the very Printer of them, (as you have seen by his Answer to *Drouart's* Advertisement against him in 1609) ever pretended they could be any thing else; and were they true Copies, they are of Course useless, because we have the Originals. But their Case is worse; I have already shewn you, that the first *Francfort* Volume in Folio in 1608, and also the *Francfort* Octavo, have from the *Drouarts* Octavo in 1604 foisted in the Story of the *Lapis Indicus*, which was omitted in the *Drouarts* Folio of 1606: This was done either wilfully, *i. e.* sillily and wrongly judged; or carelessly, *i. e.* without comparing the first *Paris* Octavo Edition with the latter Folio: (What Care has been taken in these *Francfort* Editions with Regard to other Passages wherein the *Drouarts* Octavo and Folio may vary, and where Respect ought to have been had (as you have seen the *Drouarts* reproach the *Francfort* Printer) to the last printed of the two, I have said before was not worth the while to examine minutely; and you now see why, because I have just shewn you that the *Francfort* Editions to the 80th Book of *Thuanus* inclusive, as being but Copies, good or bad, of those of *Paris*, are useless to our new Edition.) I am now to acquaint you likewise, that the *Francfort* Printer has acted disingenuously: When *Lingelshelm's* Edition came out at *Geneva* in 1620, the *Francfort* Printer copied from it all the latter Part of the History, *viz.* from the 80th Book to the End, and joyning it, as also the *Vita Thuani*, to his former Volumes in Folio, (as if those former Volumes had not differed at all from the *Geneva* Edition of 1620) he puts them off together for a compleat Set of *Thuanus*. The like he does by his Set of Octavos; in 1621 he prints the two last Volumes from the *Geneva* Edition of 1620, and putting these to his three first Volumes, the second and third of which were printed in 1614. makes up another compleat *Thuanus*. I will shew you, by one strong Instance, the Consequence of these mis-matched and patched up Editions. The Author of *Thuanus Restitutus*, published in 1663, remarks, that whereas in the latter Part of the 95th Book of the *Geneva* Editions, *Thuanus* gives a large Account of the Council of *Trent*; all that large Account

count is wanting in the same (35th) Book of the *Francfort* Edition Octavo. Why yes, it is wanting, and how should it be otherwise? For the second and third Volumes of that *Francfort* Edition (where that 35th Book is) were printed in 1614, and copied from the *Paris* Editions, not one of which has that Account of the Council of *Trent*: That Account was first printed in the *Geneva* Edition of 1620, and never before. The Author of *Thuanus Restitutus* has omitted to observe, upon this Subject of the Council of *Trent*, that the said *Francfort* Octavo has not the Account of the first Proceedings of that Council, which is placed at the Beginning of the 32d Book, in both the *Geneva* Editions, that of 1620 and that of 1626—30: And that there is also an Addition in the 35th Book of the *Geneva* Edition of 1626—30, to the Account given of that Council in the same (35th) Book of the *Geneva* Edition of 1620; which, by the way, if *Heidegger* had known, he might have saved himself the trouble of putting at the end of his *Anatome* and *Tumulus Conc. Trid.* the History of that Council by *Thuanus* from a M. S. he found at *Zurich*: For that M. S. contains nothing more than what I have described to be, partly in one partly in the other, of the two *Geneva* Editions.

TITIUS has observed one Thing, that I think proper to take Notice of here, *Thuanus* at the End of his 80th Book gives this Account of *Janus Gulielmius*. *Eodem* *mense* (Junio A. 1584.) *Janus Gulielmius*, *Adolescens* *cultissimi ingenii*, *Lubeca* *natus*, *Avarici Biturigum*, *quo* *ad magnum Cujacium audiendum profectus fuerat*, *contracto* *ex nimiis caloribus morbo*, *vix salutata urbe*, *decessit*; *cum* *nondum XXX* *vita annum attigisset*: *eo magis* *deploranda* *morte*, *quod multa*, *et inter ea* *novam Ciceronis* *operum*, *ad M. S.* *Exemplaria* *diligentissime* *collatorum*, *et amplius* *sexcentis* *clausulis* *suppletorum*, *Edicionem* *paratam* *habe**ret*: *quam et ego Lutetiae*, *dum is ad me* *familiariter* *ventitaret*, *vidi*; *hattenus*, *magna rei literaria* *jactura*, *aut disperditam*, *aut suppressam*. Thus stood the Passage in *Drouart's* Folio and Duodecimo Editions at *Paris*. The first *Francfort* Folio and Octavo Editions give the same Passage, with the following Addition: *Cujus (Gulielmii)* *familiaritate*, *dum Lutetiae* *effet*, *diu magna cum animi* *oblectatione* *usus*, *hoc vere* *profiteri* *possum*, *me semper* *ab Amicissimi Juvenis colloquio* *meliorem ac doctiorem* *distessisse*, *tanta erat in eo* *morum probitas*, *tantum in* *Literis*

Litteris judicium, tanta in sermocinando suavitas, ut alium vix meminerim (multos autem audiri) qui Latine similiter cum facilitate et puritate loqueretur. Ut omissam raram in Poetica felicitatem, sive Graca verteret, sive versus ex ingenio ficeret. Amicitiam, non tam astatis similitudine, quam studiorum consensione contractam, immatura Mors diremit; non tamen omnino solvit: cuius hoc qualemque Monumentum ad Posterioritatem extare voluit. This additional Caracter of *Gulielmius* is so amiable, that every good-natured Man cannot but wish it were authentick and might be preserved.

TITIUS takes it for granted, for no other Reason than merely because it was printed in the first *Francfort* Folio and Octavo, that it must needs be genuine; and therefore valuing himself upon the Discovery, that it was left out of all the other Editions, he would fain restore and preserve it, *Dabitur nobis veniam* (says he) *si, ut istud monumentum extaret, dandam his quoque operam duximus.* But, in the first Place, it is not in any *Paris* Edition, so could not be copied from thence by the *Francfort* Printer. In the next Place, *Janus Gruterus*, who made use of *Gulielmius's* Collections in publishing the *Hambourg* Edition of *Cicerio* in 1618, (and who held a very friendly Correspondence with *Thuanus*, as appears by the M. S. Copy of a Letter of *Thuanus* to him in 1613 about *Gulielmius*, which is written in a spare Leaf before the Title of that *Hambourg* Edition with which you was pleased to favour me, Sir, out of your own Library;) *Gruterus*, I say, in a Collection of *Elogia* of *Gulielmius* prefixed to that Work, gives the Passage first quoted from *Thuanus*, without the Addition we are speaking of. Nor is that Addition to be found in *Liegelshain's* Edition of *Thuanus* from his own Copy in 1620, (where yet it is remarkable, that an additional Account of *Bucolzerus* is placed immediately after that of *Gulielmius*;) so that *Thuanus* may be presumed to have had *Gulielmius* then in his Eye.) Nor is it in the other *Genova* Edition of 1626—30. And what is most remarkable, it is left out of the last *Francfort* Edition of 1625—28, tho' published by the very same *Kopffus* who printed the two former *Francfort* Editions, where this Addition was inserted: Which I take to be a sufficient Avowal, that it was an Interpolation in those former *Francfort* Editions. *Teissier*, who extracted from *Thuanus*, and published in *French*, his *Eloges des Hommes savans*, translates

lates *Thuanus's Account of Gulielmus* without the Addition in Question; but by Way of Supplement gives that Addition, and quotes for it *Thuanus de vita sua*: In this he must have trusted to his Memory, which deceived him, for there is no such Passage to be found in the *Vita Thuani* of any Edition. M. von Stokken, the Compiler of *Thuanus Enucleatus* printed in Quarto at *Helmsbad*, who made it his Busines to connect under the Name of every Person mentioned in good Part or in bad in *Thuanus's History*, whatever is said of that Person in the whole Course or the several Parts of that History; and who has also made an Extract of the *Vita Thuani*; gives the Caracter of *Janus Gulielmus*, without the said Addition.

RETURNING to *Lingelshiem's Edition of Thuanus at Geneva* in 1620, (which I may be frequently obliged to do, that being the Ground-work of our new Edition,) let me put you in Mind, Sir, that it is to the 80th Book of the History, and not after, that we are to be at the Trouble of collating that Edition of 1620 with all those of *Paris*: At the same Time be pleased to observe, that we are under none of that Embarrassment for the Continuation of the History, viz. from the 80th Book to the 138th inclusive, that is to say, for the additional 58 Books which *Lingelshiem* first published in 1620, nor for the *Commentariorum Thuani de Vita sua Libri VI.* which were also first published by *Lingelshiem* in 1620; there having never been any Edition at *Paris* of those last 58 Books of the History, or of the 6 *de Vita Thuani*.

HAVING declared that *Lingelshiem's Edition of Thuanus at Geneva* 1620, shall be the Foundation, or Text, of our new Edition; it is necessary to apprise you thoroughly of the Value of that *Geneva Edition*.

IN the first place, it is certain there were two Copies of *Thuanus's History compleat*; one of which he had deposited in the Hands of *Lingelshiem*; and another which he left behind him at *Paris*, and by his Will committed to the Care of *Petrus Puteanus* and *Nicolaus Rigalius*. Now it is more than probable, that *Lingelshiem* published the Copy intrusted to him, with the Knowledge and Consent of those Gentlemen, who had lived in most intimate Friendship and Familiarity with *Thuanus*, a great many Years. *Rigalius* in *Vita Petri Puteani* which he published in 1652, having (p. 22.) said his and *Puteanus's Acquaintance* had been

of

of 50 Years standing, goes on thus, *Illius vero semiser
culi Annos octodecim sibi vindicat Jacobus Augustus
Thuanus, etenim tamdiu ego & Puteanus cum ipso per-
petua familiaritate conjunctissimi viximus. Summa illic
opinandi, interrogandi, ac differendi libertas. Sic tamen,
ut honoris & modestie magistra severitas ubique praeceperet :
Summa fides, summus candor, summa sinceritas.* Surely
it cannot be doubted, that *Thuanus* made these two Per-
sons privy to his sending *Lingelshiem* a perfect Copy of
his History : And it can as little be doubted, that *Lingel-
shiem*, (who added to his Edition *Thuanus*'s Will, where-
in the Care of publishing the other perfect Copy he left
behind him is declared to be committed to those two
Persons,) did by Letters consult them, and take their
secret Advice and Consent, before he published his Copy.
For the Probability of this, I offer a plain Argument,
viz. *Thuanus* died in *May 1617*, and the first Volume
of his History was published by *Rob. Stephens* at *Paris* in
1618. *Lingelshiem* reprinted that Volume for his Edi-
tion. So that he did not put his Edition to the Press, till
a Year at least after *Thuanus* died. In that Interval of
Time he might, and in my Opinion most certainly did,
concert Measures with *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius* : For do but
weigh, Sir, the Terms in which he mentions their defer-
ring to publish the Copy *Thuanus* left to their Care, *quod
auctor quodammodo praviderat, fore, ut iniquitas Temporum
impedimento esset, id ipsum in causa esse deprehendi, cur illi
editionem diutius premant.* Does not the Word *deprehendi*
imply a Correspondence between them ? And does not
that Correspondence imply, that what the Times in *France*
would not permit them to do, they might willingly con-
sent should be done by him ? For, once more, what
does the *Iniquitas Temporum* imply, but among other
Things, that they could not obtain a Privilege for printing
Thuanus? You will judge by the Letter I have quoted above
from *M. de Peiresc* to *Camden*, that there were Persons
then in Power at the Court of *France*, who (whether they
attempted or not, as *Peiresc* had been told, to influence
Thuanus's Executors to sacrifice the Manuscript of his
History to them,) might very easily hinder the granting
a Privilege for printing it.

I N the next place, as it is probable that *Lingelshiem*'s
Copy of *Thuanus*'s History was published with the
Knowledge and Consent of *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius* ;
so it is certain, that after it was published those Gentle-
men

men acknowledged it (bating the Errors in the transcribing or printing it, which are numerous) to be a true and authentick Copy : which is the same thing in Effect, as publishing that which *Thuanus* committed to their Care. Of this I shall lay before you clear and sufficient Proof.

BOTH *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius* did severally apply themselves to perform the Task enjoyned them by their deceased Friend. They each of them read over all the Volumes of *Lingelshiem's* Edition, and in the Margin of their respective Books wrote down or marked many verbal and even literal Corrections, Emendations of Expressions ; Alterations of some Passages, a few Rasures of others ; and also Insertions of Passages, very considerable for their Number and for their Import. In doing this, they very friendly, and with perfect Integrity and good Conscience, made use of the Power and Liberty *Thuanus* had given them by his Will. Their Corrections are such, as were made necessary by the Negligence of the Copyst or Printer ; their Emendations, or Alterations and Rasures might have been made at their own Discretion, (with what Discretion the Reader will judge when he sees them distinguished in our new Edition;) and as for the Passages inserted, they are probably gathered from *Thuanus's* own Papers, he having bequeathed to them all his Writings. One thing more is to be observed, which is, that from the strict Friendship and Intercourse of Studies which subsisted between these two Persons for a long Course of years, it is reasonable to conjecture they communicated to each other what they noted severally in their respective Sets of *Thuanus* : But happily we have something more than Conjecture in this Case, for in most of the inserted Passages they agree ; so that they must have drawn them from the same Source, or settled them by Concert.

BUT here I must take Notice, that these two Persons, instead of avowedly publishing *Thuanus's* perfect Copy, or *parata Editio* as he calls it in his Will, by it self, as they found it ; and giving their Emendations, and the Supplemental Passages they gathered, distinctly and apart from the Author's Text ; took such a Method to convey into the World those their Emendations and Supplements, as has not only exercised the Pens and puzzled the Heads of *Titius* and others, but disgusted the more sensible Readers, and curious Collectors of Books,

the

the latter finding (after great Expence) that each Edition of this most instructive History, differs from all and every one of the rest. The Fact stands thus,

I H A V S in my Hands Copies, taken with great Exactness, I. Of *Puteanus's Corrections, and Insertions*, which were written by himself in the Margin of his Exemplar or Set of *Thuanus* of *Lingelshiem's Edition*; II. The Corrections and Insertions, which were marked by *Rigaltius* in the Margin of his Set of *Thuanus* of *Lingelshiem's Edition*: And III. A Collection of Passages copied from what is called the *Autographon*, or *Thuanus's M. S.* of his History, kept in the Royal Library at *Paris*.

By cursorily comparing them with the last *Francfort* Edition of 1625—1628, and the last *Geneva* Edition of 1626—1630, I find, that Copies from the said three Collections were communicated to the *Francfort* Editor; and Copies from the two first of those Collections to the *Geneva* Editor. But, as the *Francfort* Editor had Passages from the Authors M. S. principally, which the *Geneva* Editor had not; so, in the two other Collections, the *Geneva* Edition has some Passages which the *Francfort* has not. It seems difficult to account for this: What I take to be the true State of the Matter, is,

THE *Francfort* Printer's two first Volumes of *Thuanus's History* are dated 1625. He must have been furnished from *Paris*, some time before he put them to the Press, with those Collections as they stood at the Time they were copied.

THE *Geneva* Printer's first two Volumes are dated 1626. So that he might have been furnished from *Paris* with the Collections I have mentioned, a Year after the *Francfort* Printer had his; in which Time probably they were augmented, or altered.

FOR you will be pleased, Sir, to take Notice, that both *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius* were living then and long after [the first died in 1652, the latter in 1653;] and you will easily imagine, that in the Course of their Reading and Observation, some Papers might be reviewed, and others come to Hand, and Materials occur to them, with which they might judge it proper from Time to Time to improve *Thuanus*: They looking upon themselves as constantly vested with that Power and Liberty, by the Will of *Thuanus*.

THAT they did think so, and act accordingly, I will give you a very plain Instance. *Titius* is in great Anxi-

ety for himself and his Readers, and cannot recover from his Astonishment, how it should come to pass, that *Thuanus* dying in 1617, and *Lingelsheim* publishing a perfect Copy of his History in 1620, there should be a Passage concerning *Franciscus Junius* printed in that *Geneva* Edition of 1620, copied by those of *Francfort* in 1621, and again copied by that of *Francfort*, in 1628, and yet altered very materially in that of *Geneva* of 1630! Why, thus it was; in 1627 *Gerard Vossius* published his Book *de Historicis Latinis*, in the Preface to which he lays it to *Thuanus*'s Charge, that being partly misled by *Jos. Scaliger*, and partly by a Slip of Memory imputing to *Franciscus Junius* what he meant to have said of *Hugo Donellus*, he (*Thuanus*) had given a defamatory Account of the said *Junius*, whose Daughter *Vossius* married: Hereupon *Puteanus* or *Rigaltius* very honestly amended what *in Fact* was obviously erroneous in that Account of *Junius*: The *Francfort* Edition (the last Volume of which, where the said Passage is, came out in 1628,) was too far advanced: But in that of *Geneva* (the last Volumes of which came not out till 1630) it is amended. I say *Puteanus* or *Rigaltius* amended what was wrong *in Fact*; but without altering any thing in the Judgment which *Thuanus* passes on *Junius*'s Parts and Writings: which Judgment *Vossius* complains much of. Therefore all that *Vossius* has said about this Matter, in that Preface, and in his Epistles, shall be placed, where it may come in most properly in our Edition.

I must not omit to observe expressly, That after *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius* had furnished the *Francfort* and *Geneva* Editors with their Emendations, they continued to make others in the Margins of their respective Sets of *Thuanus*: I say they continued so doing after the Year 1630, which is the Date of the last *Geneva* Edition.

THE next Thing to be observed, and what indeed created the greatest Puzzle, is, that neither the last *Frantfort* nor *Geneva* Editors take the least Notice whatsoever, either by Preface or Advertisement, of their having been furnished by any Person, with or without Name, with Corrections or supplemental Passages (the *Geneva* Edition bearing only in the Title-Page that it is *priore emendator*;) but have silently dropped, (I mean without any Notice or Reason given, have left out) some Passages; and where they have made any Emendations,

Emendations, Supplements, or Additions, have (without using so much as the Distinction of a different Letter or typographical Caracter) interspersed and blended them with the former Text in the Body of the History.

I will not take upon me to pronounce positively what were the Reasons of this Procedure: But in all Conjecture and Likelihood, that *Iniquitas Temporum in France*, which restrained *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius* from publishing avowedly the Copy *Thuanus* left to them, operated so far upon them, as to oblige them to conceal themselves in what Improvements they contributed to the said *Francfort* and *Geneva* Editions. Of this Care to conceal themselves, I will give you a very clear Evidence. In the *Vita Thuani*, which was first published by *Lingelsheim* in 1620, there is at the End of the 5th Book this Passage, *Sed rursus Stilum inhibeo, & veniam a Lectore peto, si in tam justa causa defensione pro viri innocentis dignitate longius & cum calore aliquo evagatus sum, fecique quod ille non fecisset nec factum vellet.* Whoever reads the *Vita Thuani* (without meeting with, or attending to this Passage,) would think (as I believe it has been generally thought) it was written by *Thuanus* himself: But this Passage intimating that it was written by another Hand, and *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius* being sensible that one of them would be very naturally suspected to be that Hand; they took Care to expunge it, in the Corrections sent to the *Geneva* Editor; and accordingly it is omitted in the Edition there of 1626—1630. As for the last *Francfort* Edition of 1625—1628, the like Care was not taken timely, so that this Passage stands in that Edition: Or rather, I should say the *Francfort* Printer did not give Time for that Care to take Effect, he having printed off the *Vita Thuani* before he began the *History*; at least my Set of that Edition gives me ground to believe so, for there the *Vita* is dated 1621: And probably all the Sets of that Edition are in this respect alike; if so, the *Francfort* Printer's Patch-work went on to the last.

A further and very remarkable Proof, of the Caution the said Gentlemen used, to avoid appearing in any thing relating to *Thuanus*'s *History*, is this; that so far on as the Year 1633, when *Jacobus Puteanus* the Brother of *Petrus* (who *Rigaltius* tells us lived constantly with him in the same House,) had compiled the *Index Nominum propriorum in Thuani Historiis*; it was thought proper,

for

for concealing the real Author's Name, to get the Privilege for printing it taken out by one *Pierre Bessin*, who *M. Menage* (in the 33d Article of his *Antibaillet* P. I.) says was *Valet de Chambre de M. de Thou le Conseiller d'Etat*, lequel *Bessin ne scavoit point du tout de Latin*: And accordingly the Privilege prefixed to the Edition of that Index in 1634 in *Quarto*, is granted to *Pierre Bessin*.

I F *Titius* had not drawn me in to say so much as I have already of the Story of the *Lapis Indicus*, I might have spared mentioning, what I now do here, that the *Francfort* Printer, upon his being favoured with the Collections I have mentioned by *Thuanus*'s Friends, prevailed with himself to leave out of his last Edition that Story, of which he had been so tenacious, *frustra reclamante Autore*, in his former.

I proceed now to give you some Account of *Thuanus Restitutus*, which was published at *Amsterdam* in 1663, in *Duodecimo*; and, as *P. le Long* says, was compiled by *M. de Wicquefort*.

THE Editor gives this Account of it: *Cum nuper in manus pervenisset manuscriptum exemplar Locorum quos hic damus; deinde & alterum, quod constabat ex ipso autographo illustrissimi Thuani descriptum; —— tum Viri tum Historia dignitas postulare videbatur, has ejus non contemnendas lacinias quamprimum pralo subjicere, quo celeberrimum hocce opus non misilum, sed integrum habeatur.*

Would not any one imagine that this Collection, which is declared to have been published *quo celeberrimum hocce opus integrum habeatur*, does, (with the *Geneva* Edition of 1626, that of *Francfort* 1625 — 1628 in *Folio*, that of *Francfort* in *Octavo*, and the old *Paris* Edition in *Folio*, with which the Editor professes he collated it) rectify and supply all Errors and Defects, and restore this Work to its Perfection?

So the Editor would bear us in Hand. But how far short he falls of his Pretensions, will soon appear.

THE first Manuscript he used, is a Collection of *Addenda vel Delenda*, which *Rigaltius* appears to have made after the last *Francfort* and *Geneva* Editions came out; the greatest Part of the Collection consisting of such Passages as are neither in them, nor in any other of those Editions with which the said Editor compared them, as is visible by his References to them severally

verally all along. The other, is that M. S. of *Thuanus*, which is kept in the King's Library at *Paris*. Both these he gives promiscuously, without distinguishing in any Manner, which Passages are copied from *Rigaltius's Collection*, and which from *Thuanus's* M. S.; a Distinction that would have been acceptable to every curious Reader.

As to the *Emendationes Puteanae*, which are numerous and valuable, and were very much augmented after the last *Frankfort* and *Geneva* Editions came out, he had them not in M. S. Yet they are absolutely necessary towards restoring *Thuanus's History* to its Perfection.

BUT, not to lay Stress upon this; I will take a plain and simple Method to convince you, Sir, of the Defects and Errors of *Thuanus Restitutus*, even in what he undertook to publish; which Method is, not by picking and culling here and there in that Compilation, but taking it at its Beginning, and giving a Specimen of its Faults in the first two or three Pages.

Thuanus Restitutus begins with a Passage to be inserted pag. 18. D. lin. 7. of the first Volume of the History, of the *Geneva* Edition 1620. But our Copy of *Rigaltius's Corrections*, has several Emendations in the preceding Pages of that Volume, viz.

Pag. 7. D. lin. 5. *Post verba Betancurium nostratem dele Belgam.* *Puteanus* makes the same Correction, and says, scribe *e Calatibus in Neustria oriundum*. Neither of these Corrections are made in the last *Frankfort* or the last *Geneva* Editions.

Pag. 9. C. lin. 9. *Post verba usque ad dele Edmondum Plantagenetam Henrici, et scribe Joannem Plantagenetam Edvardi III.* The Editor of *Thuanus Restitutus* should have taken Notice, that the last *Frankfort* Edition (which he says he perused) has not this Correction; tho the last *Geneva* has it.

Ead. D. lin. 2. *Post verbum Edvardi dele II Regis F. et scribe III altero filio.* The last *Frankfort* Edition has not this Correction; the last *Geneva* has, but has it faultily, having added an F. (for filio) too much.

Ead. E. lin. 1. *Post verbum Caroli dele VII et scribe VI.* This Correction is made in the last *Geneva* Edition, but not in the last *Frankfort*.

Pag. 10. A. lin. 2. *Post verbum* potitur *adde fundavit*. The Sentence runs thus, *Hugonis Capeti, qui familiam regiam, qua felicissime ab eo tempore apud nos rerum potitur, fundavit, nepos.* The Omission of *fundavit*, deprives this Sentence of the very Word that gives it all its Sense and Meaning. Yet that Word is left out both of the last *Francfort* and *Geneva* Editions.

But these Omissions are of small Moment, in Comparison of the two following Passages (not to trouble you with more at present) which are in the Transcript from *Thuanus's* M. S. furnished by my Correspondent, and according to that M. S. ought to be inserted several Pages before *Thuanus Restitutus* begins, *viz.*

Pag. 10. F. lin. 4. *Post verba in bonum vertat. adde*
Nec desperandum est quin qualiscunque religionis
silvestria illa plantaria, melioris doctrina insessione,
Hispanorum jugo excusso & libertate redditâ, quasi
novella, suaveis & auctore Christo dignos fructus
aliquando producant. Ut Ortus Hispanorum sic contra
Gallorum Occasus causas, pariter Religioni tribuo. Nam cum Christiana pietas ab initio in Gallia
semper floruerit, ut quam monsstris caruisse scripserit
Hieronymus, purioris Doctrina cultum hoc dicto in
ea semper viguisse innuens; verendum erat, ne cres-
cente in Italia potentia Gallorum, quibus tantas opes
Pontifices Romani debere se negare non possunt, una
& potentia Romana in immensam & Orbi Christiano
intolerandam magnitudinem evaderet. Quod ab
Hispanis minimè metuendum fuit; quippe qui non
tam pontificia magnitudini inserviunt, quam ponti-
cii cultus pretextu id agunt, ut pontificia
auctoritas à Gallis in tantam evectione sublimita-
tem, ipsorum commodis et ambitiosis consiliis inser-
viat; et si mens non male augurat, Pontifices Roma-
ni, ut olim in ultima direptione Urbis, sic & in am-
pla adeo et invidiose potentia dissolutione, infestissimum
Hispanum aliquando experti sunt. Nos certe Galli
simplices nimis, quorum imprudentia factum est, ut
dum plus justo Religionis Custodibus & Ministris tri-
buitur, ipsi Religioni male consultum sit. Nam nihil
aque, si verum amamus, religioni obes, quam nimia
opes & immoderata unius potentia; qua si in Mo-
narchiis, ubi degenerare incipit, omnibus intolerabilis
existit, in domo Dei, ubi majore cum periculo pecca-
tur,

tur, nullo modo ferri debet. Itaque ut in iis, qua
vere ad religionem pertinent, nihil de potestate Eccle-
siastica, quam veneror & suspicio, immiuendum aut
delibandum censem, ita Pontificum Romanorum in-
teresse existimo, de potestate Terrena, quam tot jam
ab hinc faculis nimis avide conjectantur, multa refe-
cari; ipsis utique meo judicio majoribus futuris, si mi-
nores esse velint. Nam quorsum fastus ille, &
insolentes tituli, & plusquam Regia Majestas, nisi ut
Relligo simplex, candida, & per se venerabilis, in
invidiam odium & maledicentiam culpa ministro-
rum incurrat? Ut sub novis subinde Dominis nova
cottidie monstra, nova imperia, novi tyranni in Ita-
lia exoriantur? Ut pace publica turbata, & omisso
communi Christiani nominis hoste, Orbis Christianus
armis concutiat? Piget dicere & tamen dicendum
est, ex quo abjectis clavibus & relictis precibus ac
lacrimis, qua sola & vera sunt arma Sacerdotum,
sumptum sceptrum, tiara, gladius; ex eo cura pasto-
ralis negligi, disciplina sacra corrumpi, & corruptis
moribus ipsa Doctrina paullatim adulterari coepit.
Tunc omissa concilia, hoc est, neglecta Religiosorum
cum Deo fædera, & inita nova fædera cum hominibus,
ipsis ferme semper damno, certe Reipublica Christiana
luctuosa: Nec sane, si fas mortalibus de eternis Dei
consiliis pronuntiare, aliud in caussa fuisse dixerim.

Pag. 11. A. lin. 9. Post verbum amplificasset, adde,
Nam quid portentosius prisca vel nostra etas vidi-
vel audivit? hominem sacris devotum largitionibus
in Templum Dei invasisse; ibi ferro, veneno, fraude
tam diu impune grassatum esse; ex nefando coitu
susceptos liberos, omni pudore exuto, ausum propa-
lam filios appellare; incestibus homicidiis et latro-
ciniis infamem familiam aluisse; inde vitia do-
mestica in omnem Italianam sparisse; postremo Chri-
stiani gregis pastorem jurati Christianorum hostis
clandestino fædere stipendiarium fuisse! Et qui-
dem hac ab omnibus qui res illius temporis scrip-
serunt, Memoria prodita sunt, etiam iis, qui Pon-
tificii nominis reverentia multa alioqui non tacenda
silentio dissimularunt. Sed omnem fidem superat,
quod Fr. Guicciardinus, Vir fide, prudentia et elo-
quentia cuivis ex antiquitate comparandus, nulli
certe meo judicio posthabendus, scripsit, non solum
duos fratres Franciscum Candianum et Casarem,

qui postea beneficio nostro Valenii Dux factus est, incesto Lucretia sororis amore exarsisse, (quod ob rivalitatem Candiano perniciem attulit,) sed etiam ipsum parentem tam perdite filiam deperisse, ut eam a Marito priore, statim iniuio Pontificatus, quasi tanta adfiniata indigno, abduxerit, mox pudore victimum Joanni Sfortia Pisauri Domino elocavisse; et postremo, cum ne quidem maritum rivalem pati posset, Joannem ad res Venereas frigidum caussatum, subornatis falsis testibus contractum cum eo matrimonium dissoluisse: Quo nomine etiam a Jacobo Sanzzario, viro bono et eximio sui temporis Poeta passim proscinditur, et illo carmine praeipue, cujuscunque tandem sit, quo Lucretia filia, sponsa, nurus Alexandri fuisse perhibetur. Mitto Astorem Manfredum Faeventia Dominum eximia forma puerum supratum, et contra datam fidem postea necatum; tot illustres Duces inde a filio Senegalliae, inde a patre Roma crudeliter occisos; et Venenum Cardinalibus paratum ab ipso Alexandro epotum; que mors tali vita dignissima fuit. Cum tali monstro juncta adfinitatis contagia et piacula res nostras infecisse, et optimi Principis fortunam in praeceps dedisse, merito existimare possumus.

FROM these Omissions of the Editor of *Thuanus Restitutus*, I proceed to shew you some Errours, in his first Pages.

THE Passage he sets out with, is not in the last Geneva, but in the last Francfort Edition, and (as he rightly says) mutilated. The former Part of it however, which is in that Edition, runs thus, *Ferunt Clementem implacabili tunc in Gallos odio ardentem, vix post consummatas nuptias sibi adhuc credentem dixisse, sibi abunde paenarum de Gallis sumptum esse, cum provideret fore, ut ex illa face, (ita patruelis filiam vocabat,) magnum incendium O L I M I N G A L L I A E X O R I R E T U R.* This last Sentence stands in the same Words in our Copy of Rigaltius's Corrections: But in *Thuanus Restitutus* it is thus, *magnum incendium experiretur.* The leaving out *olim in Gallia*, leaves the Sense of the Period undetermined and defective; and with those Words, *exoriretur* is more proper then *experiretur*, after *magnum incendium*: And taking the Period without

without those Words, *experiretur* should be *experi-
rentur* to agree with *Gallis*.

IN Page 3. there is a long Passage, which is neither in the last *Francfort* nor *Geneva* Editions: In the Middle of which Passage are these Words, *Hieronymus Faletius, in libris de Bello Grmanico, ubique Claudium et Franciscum, Claudi filios, non Lotharingos, sed Andegavenses appellat. Janus denique Vitalis — Poeta — Carolum Cardinalem Andegavensem, et Regiam progeniem, ac maximum Andegavis gentis appellat.* *Rigaltius's* true Reading (which agrees with *Patisson's* Edition) is thus, *ubi-
que Claudium, et Franciscum Claudi filium —
and maximum Andegava gentis honorem —*.

FROM this Specimen, I may presume you will take my Word, that the Editor of *Thuanus Restitutus* has not only omitted a great Number of Corrections and Supplements; but committed palpable Faults, in his Transcripts from the M. S. *Thuani*, and from *Rigaltius's* Collection.

HAVING told you, Sir, that what is called the *Autographon*, or *Thuanus's* own Manuscript of his History, is kept in the King's Library at *Paris*; I am apprehensive you want to be resolved, 1. Whether that M. S. be the *parata Editio* which *Thuanus* left behind him? or, 2. What became of that *parata Editio*? I cannot yet answer the last Question, I hope my Correspondent in *France* will be able to do it, after the Inquiries which he is so diligently making there. But as for the first Question, I think it is already in my Power to answer directly, that it is not that *parata Editio*. For

THUANUS, in his last Will made in 1616, says *Historiarum mearum paratam Editionem, si ante quam ipsa edatur moriar, Puteano et Rigaltio committo.* He put the first Volume of it to the Press before he died in 1617, which came out at *Paris* in 1618, and was afterwards declared by *Lingelshiem* to agree intirely with the Copy the Author had deposited in his Hands *paulo antequam excederet*. Consequently, so much of the Work was done and over, and even put out of the Care of *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius*. Now, there are in *Thuanus Restitutus*, and in the last *Francfort* Edition of the History, (as well as in the Transcript my Correspondent has furnished) some Passages from the first Volume of the said *Autographon*,

that are not in the same Volume printed at *Paris* in 1618. which printed Volume had been finally settled by the Author, and received his last Hand, before he died: And consequently, that *Autographon* now kept in the Royal Library at *Paris*, is not what the Author in his Will calls *para-ta Editio*. Besides this argumentative Proof, there is a positive one; for my Correspondent has written at the Beginning of his Transcript of this *Autographon*, *N. B.* *This M. S. belonged to M. Du Puy; in whose Hand-writing in a spare Leaf before it, is a Memorandum, that it was given him by M. de Thou, Dec. 31, 1612.*

THE Result from the whole Account I have laid before you, Sir, is this. That whoever is possessed of every Edition yet extant of *Thuanus's History*, has not one perfect and correct Edition among them all; nor can by the Help of *Thuanus Restitutus* (which I have shewn you is defective and faulty, and is indeed more so than you would endure I should shew you by more Instances on so dry a Subject) make up a perfect Book out of them all.

ANOTHER thing resulting from that Account, is that *Thuanus's* own Text of *Lingelshiem's* Edition in 1620, being preserved intire in our new Edition, the Emendations and Additions left by *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius*, and the Variations collected out of what is called the Author's M. S. should in every Page be placed apart from the Text, and distinguished severally. The Reasons of such Distinction are, I. As to the Author's M. S., *Puteanus's* Memorandum in a spare Leaf before it shews, that it was given him in 1612; whereas *Lingelshiem* says he had his Copy from the Author *a little before his Death*, which was in 1617; and consequently the said M. S. cannot be understood to be an Authority for altering or inserting any Passage in *Lingelshiem's* Edition: The true Value, indeed, to be set on that M. S. is, that it contains what were once the Thoughts of *Thuanus*; and because they were so, are well worth preserving.

And II. as to the Emendations of *Puteanus* and *Rigaltius*; their Corrections of the manifestly literal or verbal Errors of the Copyist or Printer, shall be amended in the Text itself; but as for their Alterations, Insertions, or Rasures, that make any Variation in the Author's Sense, the Text, as I said, must stand clear of them, and they be kept by themselves on the same Page.

A signal Instance or two will suffice to convince you how necessary it is to use this Precaution, viz.

TO WAR'S the End of the 46th Book of *Lingelstein's* Edition of the History in 1620, Tom. II. p. 632. is this Passage, *Eodem tempore Anna Austria Maximiliani Cæsaris F. Philippo avunculo despousata, ad mari- tum in Hispaniam tendens è Zelandia solvit; ad quam per Mare Britannicum deducendam Elisabetha, quæ si- bi illius imperium, rebus apud nos turbatis, arrogabat, officiose Carolum Howardum cum bellica Classe et selecta Nobilitate misit, nondum renudato pror- fus contra Philippum odio, et constantibus adhuc inter ipsam et Familiam Austriacam continuis amicitiæ officiis.* Which Passage *Rigaltius* having in his Emendations struck out, it is omitted both in the last *Francfort* and *Geneva* Editions. To do all the Justice I can to *Rigal- tius*, I must take Notice, that in the very next Book (the 47th) *Thuanus* speaking again of this Matter, uses these Words, *Elisabetha Angliae Regina Carolum Howardum maris prefectum officiose ad eam per mare Britannicum deducendam, cum bellica &c. as above, except mutuis for continuis.* This differing only in one Sentence (which I have distinguished above by putting it in Capitals) from what *Thuanus* had said before, it is my Conjecture that *Rigaltius* might consult his Friend *Camden's Annales Elizabethæ* for the Fact intimated in that Sentence; and finding in *Camden* no more than the Words following, *Ad quam per mare Britannicum in Hispaniam deducendam Elizabetha Carolum Howardum cum bellicosa classe, et selectis nobilibus misit, summa cum honoris et amoris in Austriacam familiam testificatione,* might think fit to drop that Sentence as not warranted by *Camden*; and then the rest being exactly the very same thing said twice, he chose to strike it out of the first Place it stood in, and keep it in the second, where he judged it came in more properly. But, notwithstanding *Camden's* Silence, that Sentence is too remarkable, as well for the Fact, as for *Thuanus's* Reflection upon it, to be rejected and sunk in Oblivion: As to the Fact, I find it mentioned by *Hakluyt* in his Dedication of the first Volume of his Collection of *English Voyages* to the said Lord *Charles Howard*, in these Words, *When the Emperour's Sister, the Spouse of Spain, with a Fleet of an 130 Sailes, stoutly and proudly passed the narrow Seas, your Lordship accompanied with ten Ships onely of her*

Majesies

Majesties Navis Roial, environed their Fleet in most strange and warrelike Sort, enforced them to stoop gallant, and to vaile their Bonets for the Queene of England, and made them perfectly to understand that olde speach of the Prince of Poets,

Non illi imperium pelagi sœvumq; tridentem,
Sed sibi sorte datum.

Yet after they had acknowledged their dutie, your Lordship on her Majesties behalfe conducted her safely through our English channell, and performed all good offices of honour and humanitie to that forren Princesse. At that time all England beholding your most honourable cariage of your Self in that so weightie Service, began to cast an extraordinarie eie upon your lordship, &c. As to Thuanus's Reflection on this Fact, I must leave it to the publick Judgment.

I t happens unluckily, that while I am endeavouring to excuse Rigalius for striking out a memorable Sentence of *Thuanus*; another of his Emendations occurs to me, for which I cannot find an Excuse. In *Pag. 991. C. l. 6.* of the 2d Tome of the *Geneva Edition 1620*, is this Passage, *mortuo Carolo, Londini magno paratu exequia ab Elisabetha Regina in majore Urbis Templo VItili proximo celebata sunt.* Rigalius having struck out this Passage, it is accordingly omitted both in the last *Francfort* and *Geneva Editions*. But the Fact is affirmed by *Camden* in his *Ann. Eliz.* in these Words, —*Carolus Rex diem obiit ultimam, cui exequiarum justa in Templo Paulino Londini summo cum honore perfulsa.*

Thuanus restitutus has not a Word about either of these two omitted Passages; which yet I presume you will think deserve and ought to be restored.

You will conclude, Sir, from the Instances I have given you, what Vigilance is requisite to be used in our new Edition.

At the same Time, let me assure you, Sir, that the more vigilantly any one looks to the Emendations of *Puteanus* and *Rigalius*, he will, upon the whole, find the greater Cause to esteem and admire their Application and Accuracy in revising and improving the Work of their excellent Friend. How could they, indeed, act coldly and slightly, who had passed many Years so agreeably with him as *Rigalius* describes in the following Passage p. 24. et seq. *Vita Puteani? Uberrimam nqbris amicorum copiam præstabant frequentes apud Thuanum*

anum coitiones, ad quem ex omnibus Urbis ordinibus et regni provinciis, atque etiam de nationibus exteris honestissimi ac studiosissimi confluabant. Magna illic seges et maiora noscendi, quid in Urbe, quid in Senatu, quid in provinciis notabile contigerat, et quid novi de transmarinis aut transmontanis vela, remiges, cursores attulerant.—Hoc vitae suavissimae honestissimaeque instituto Puteanus sorte sua contentus studia sic dividebat, ut otii partem veterum scriptorum commentariis evolvens, partem chartis negotiorum publicorum dispiciendis; interea vero amicorum officiis ultiro citroque colendis, horas in dies singulos impenderet. Hanc sibi disciplinam formaverat ad exemplum Thuani, quem in primis observabat; et vicissim Thuanus cognati sui moribus et consuetudine oblectabatur. Ego quidem certe in utriusque amicitia sic eram, ut quanto magis Puteanus me diligebat, quantoque magis ego Puteanum redamabam, tanto nos Thuanus ambos amabiliore vinculo constringeret. Sic annos egimus aliquammultos, nostrique Thuani casibus consiliisque sive laevis sive tristibus individui, saepenero etiam bonis et liquidis coeli tempestatisbus in Villabonio suo rusticanti adhaesimus, semper invicem adoptatissimi comites. Historias Thuanus, horis ab Senatu subsecivis, et nonnunquam poemata; Puteanus observationes ad regni reique publicae negotia pertinentes condebat; ego, quae veterum Scriptorum, sed praeſertim Christianorum scitis illustrandis ac restituendis olim profutura videbantur, componebam. Magna vero semper et prompta nobiscum fuit communitas omnium quae notabilia quisque legendendo, scribendo, maxime autem audiendo percepit. Et quamplurimum certe Thuanus, qua dignitate sive auctoritate pollebat, multis quotidie procerum frequentatus, in communitatem conferebat; nec ab eo discessimus unquam nisi doctiores aut meliores: Sic omnia castigabat examine sapientissimo.

PUTEANUS, particularly, who was related to Thuanus, transferred to his Children the Love and Friendship he had born to their Father. And when Cardinal Richelieu had compassed the Death of his Friend's Son, Rigalius tells us (p. 70. Vit. Put.) Francisci Thuani exitium indignissime tulit, atque inter tristissima sua duxit. Juvenis minime fontis memoriam, cognitione dispercta, purgari ac redintegrari debere; rem aequissimam non absque injuria differri; magnis rationibus peculiari volumine demonstravit. But this, and other Instances of

of the Affection of *Puteanus* to *Thuanus* and his Family, I propose to take another Opportunity to exhibit to you more simply.

Having stated and explained what has hitherto appeared in Print, relating to the Editions yet extant of *Thuanus*, and laid open so much of my Plan as relates to the Materials I have particularly mentioned; I should proceed to give you a clear Account of the Use designed to be made of several other Materials transcribed from MSS, &c. which my Correspondent in *France* has procured and sent over to me; all of them serviceable for improving our new Edition. As they have passed through your Hands, Sir, you know they are in their kind very valuable, and absolutely necessary for our Purpose. But as my Correspondent (being at this Time favoured with the Perusal of certain MSS. of one of the chief Persons in the Civil Government of *France*, in which he finds many useful Papers relating to *Thuanus's History*,) is still continuing his Searches; I will deferr drawing up that Account till he has compleated those Searches; and then make it the Subject of a Second Letter to you.

I am, with the greatest Esteem, and Respect,

S I R,

Your most humble and
obedient Servant,



1 Jan. 1728.

Sam. Buckley.

